Application No.: 10/717,838   Docket No.: ENB-006RCE

REMARKS

In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 14-16, 18, 21, 22, 25-27 and 29, and cancel claims 7, 17 and 28. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-16, 18-23, 25-27 and 29-31 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 are independent. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments can be found in previously presented claims 7, 17 and 28.

I.   Summary of Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 to recite that the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks.

Applicants have also amended claims 6, 8, 14-16, 18, 25-27 and 29 to correct clerical errors.

II.   Summary of Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-18, 20-23, 25-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,104,393 to Santos-Gomez (hereafter "Santos-Gomez") in view of United States Patent Publication Number 2004/0098313 to Agrawal et al. (hereafter "Agrawal").

Claims 9, 19 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez and Agrawal in view of United States Patent Number 6,128,622 to Bach et al. (hereafter "Bach").

III.   Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-18, 20-23, 25-29 and 31

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-18, 20-23, 25-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez (Office Action, paragraph 5). Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-18, 20-23, 25-29 and 31 as set forth below.

9

Application No.: 10/717,838   Docket No.: ENB-006RCE

A.   Claim 1

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez and Agrawal, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the following features of amended independent claim 1: "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," and "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

i)   "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks"

Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal fails to teach or suggest "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1.

In one aspect of the claimed invention, one or more of the sub-tasks to be performed (and, consequently, one or more items to include in the sub-task list) depend on information entered for one or more sub-tasks (Specification, page 21, lines 9-11). In the graphical user interface illustrated in Figure 2, a sub-task list 202 presents a user with a list of sub-tasks, and a sub-task panel 204 allows the user to enter information in the respective panels of the sub-tasks. For example, the user may enter information 218 in the sub-task panel to specify the "Type" to be "IP" for the sub-task 206 ("Rule Info") (Specification, page 21, lines 12-21). The claimed invention may determine that the specification of an "IP" type by the user requires that a new sub-task 208 ("IP Addresses") be performed (Specification, page 21, lines 12-21). As a result, the claimed invention may add this new sub-task 208 to the sub-task list 202 (Specification, page 21, lines 12-21).

10

Santos-Gomez does not teach or suggest "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner points to Santos-Gomez at column 8, lines 35-45 as teaching this feature, which was recited in previously presented claim 7 (Office Action, paragraph 5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Santos-Gomez relates to integrating procedural user interfaces and object-oriented user interfaces (Santos-Gomez, abstract). The prompting approach of wizards is used during creation and modification of objects and their components (Santos-Gomez, abstract). A graphical canvas depicting these components is built incrementally during the object creation process (Santos-Gomez, abstract). The same graphical canvas is used during modification for direct selection and manipulation of components to be changed (Santos-Gomez, abstract).

Column 8, lines 35-45 of Santos-Gomez, identified by the Examiner, discusses creating and fully defining a new target object. A target object is the subject of a user's actions, e.g. "Disk space usage" automation 102 shown in Figure 3A (Santos-Gomez, column 5, lines 32-35). When a new target object is fully defined, the target object area 100 is updated to show this new object among the other target objects that have been defined previously (Santos-Gomez, column 8, lines 35-45). Thus, the target object area 100 is updated to include a new target object based on the *creation of the new target object*. Santos-Gomez does not teach or suggest adding a new target object to the target object area 100 based on information entered by the user in *performing a task corresponding to an existing target object*. As such, Santos-Gomez does not teach or suggest "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1.

Agrawal also does not teach or suggest "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner does not point to Agrawal as teaching this feature.

11

ii)   "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks"

Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal fails to teach or suggest that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1.

Santos-Gomez does not teach or suggest that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner admits that Santos-Gomez does not teach this feature (Office Action, paragraph 5).

Agrawal also does not teach or suggest that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner points to Agrawal at Figure 6 and paragraphs 108-116 as teaching this feature (Office Action, paragraph 5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Agrawal relates to a network-based payment service that provides various features for facilitating online, user-to-user payments and item purchases (Agrawal, abstract). One feature allows users to define customized pay pages for receiving payments from other users (Agrawal, abstract). The pay pages may be created using pay page templates that specify the layouts and behaviors of the pay pages (Agrawal, abstract).

Figure 6 of Agrawal illustrates a web page showing how a user can manage pay pages and pay boxes through the service provider site (Agrawal, paragraph 26). More specifically, Figure 6 shows fields for pay page settings, e.g. the title and color scheme of the pay page, the

12

Application No.: 10/717,838   Docket No.: ENB-006RCE

pay page image, etc. Input fields are provided for each setting, and default values may be provided in the input fields. A user can modify the default value of a setting by pressing the "Edit" button corresponding to the setting (Agrawal, paragraphs 110 and 112).

Thus, Agrawal teaches modifying a pay page setting by entering a modified value within its input field (Agrawal, paragraphs 110 and 112). The modified value then appears in the same input field of the setting (Agrawal, paragraphs 110 and 112). That is, the modified value appears in the same panel/input field as the panel/input field in which the user enters information. Agrawal does not teach or suggest controlling the change in a setting in one panel based on information entered by the user in another panel. As such, Agrawal does not teach or suggest "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks," as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons presented above, Santos-Gomez and Agrawal, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1.

B.   Claims 2, 4-8 and 10

Claims 2, 4-6, 8 and 10 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly claims 2, 4-6, 8 and 10 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 4-6, 8 and 10.

Claim 7 has been canceled. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7 is now moot.

C.   Claim 11

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez and Agrawal, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the following features of amended independent claim 11: "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in

13

Application No.: 10/717,838   Docket No.: ENB-006RCE

the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and "(E) determining one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal fails to teach or suggest that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and that "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks." Therefore, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 11. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 11.

D.   Claims 12, 14-18 and 20

Claims 12, 14-16, 18 and 20 depend from independent claim 11 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 11. Accordingly claims 12, 14-16, 18 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 12, 14-16, 18 and 20.

Claim 17 has been canceled. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 17 is now moot.

E.   Claim 21

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez and Agrawal, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the following features of independent claim 21: "means for changing, for each of the at least one item, the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and "means for operating the sub-task performance component to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on

14

information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal fails to teach or suggest that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and that "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks." Therefore, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 21.

F.   Claim 22

Applicants respectfully submit that Santos-Gomez fails to disclose at least the following features of independent claim 22: "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and "(E) determining one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal fails to teach or suggest that "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and that "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks." Therefore, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 22.

Application No.: 10/717,838   Docket No.: ENB-006RCE

G.   Claims 23, 25-29 and 31

Claims 23, 25-27, 29 and 31 depend from independent claim 22 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 22. Accordingly claims 23, 25-27, 29 and 31 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 23, 25-27, 29 and 31.

Claim 28 has been canceled. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 28 is now moot.

IV.   Rejection of Claims 9, 19 and 30

Claims 9, 19 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santos-Gomez and Agrawal in view of Bach (Office Action, paragraph 6). Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 9, 19 and 30 as set forth below.

A combination of Santos-Gomez, Agrawal and Bach does not teach or suggest the features of claims 9, 19 and 30. As discussed previously in connection with claim 1, a combination of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 11 and 22 from which claims 9, 19 and 30 depend, respectively. The teachings of Bach do not supplement Santos-Gomez and Agrawal in such a way as to cure the shortcomings of Santos-Gomez and Agrawal with respect to the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 22.

Bach relates to program specifications for a computer program that accesses datastore persistent objects materialized from a datastore (Bach, abstract). A wizard or task guide is displayed on a monitor attached to a computer, wherein the wizard includes a step-by-step procedure for creating the program specifications (Bach, abstract). Operator input is accepted into the computer in response to the step-by-step procedure and the program specifications are created using the operator input (Bach, abstract).

Bach fails to teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 1 from which claim 9 depends: "the sub-task list component is operable, for each of the at least one item, to control the change of the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and "the sub-task performance component is operable to determine one or more of the

16

items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

Bach fails to teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 11 from which claim 19 depends: "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and "(E) determining one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

Bach fails to teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 22 from which claim 30 depends: "(D) for each of the at least one item, changing the datum corresponding to the parameter of the sub-task displayed within the item based on information entered by the user in the panel of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks" and "(E) determining one or more of the items to include in the sub-task list based on information entered by the user in the respective panels of at least one of the two or more sub-tasks."

The Examiner does not cite Bach as teaching or suggesting these features.

For at least the reasons presented above, Santos-Gomez, Agrawal and Bach, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 9, 19 and 30. Therefore, the combination of Santos-Gomez, Agrawal and Bach does not support a valid 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9, 19 and 30.

17

Application No.: 10/717,838   Docket No.: ENB-006RCE

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. ENB-006RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: March 12, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

                                              By David R Burns
                                              David R. Burns
                                              Registration No.: 46,590
                                              LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
                                              One Post Office Square
                                              Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
                                              (617) 227-7400
                                              (617) 742-4214 (Fax)
                                              Attorney/Agent For Applicant

18